DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 201 729 CE 028 185

AUTHOR	Banta, Trudy W.; Boser, Judith A.
TITLE	Evaluation of Tennessee's State Plan for Career Education 1979-80.
INSTITUTION	Tennessee Univ., Knoxville. Bureau of Educational Research and Service.
SPONS AGENCY	Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville.
PUB DATE	Feb 81
NOTE	90p.; Best copy available. Not available in paper copy due to print quality.
AVAILABLE FROM	Bureau of Educational Research and Services, University of Tennessee, 2046 Terrace Ave., Knoxville, TN 37916 (write for price).
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Advisory Committees; *Career Education; Inservice Education; *Needs Assessment; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Social Bias; Social Discrimination; Staff Development; *State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Technical Assistance; *Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	*Tennessee

ABSTRACT

This report presents an evaluation of the career education leadership activities conducted in Tennessee in 1979-80, the first year of operation for Tennessee's five-year State Plan for Career Education. Section 1 addresses the relationship between the activities in the State Plan and a state-wide needs assessment. Sections 2-7 focus on assessment of the six elements of the State Plan: (1) administration/coordination activities of state coordinator, (2) advisory council, (3) technical assistance workshops, (4) workshop to reduce bias and stereotyping, (5) counselor workshops, and (6) summer career education festival. Final reports from twenty local projects funded under provisions of the Career Education Incentive Act (P.L. 95-207) are summarized in Section 8. Findings are organized under these headings: prior needs assessment data, project organization and support, needs assessment conducted 1979-80, staff development, other project activities, project evaluations, funding and expenditures, recommendations for the state-wide leadership effort, and achievement of state objectives. Section 9 summarizes major findings and recommendations. Suggestions are offered in the areas of objectives, involvement of teacher preparatory institutions, advisory council functioning, evaluation, project selection, and proposal guidelines. (Twenty-three tables and listings of responses display results of the various evaluations.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED201729

EVALUATION
OF
TENNESSEE'S STATE PLAN
FOR
CAREER EDUCATION
1979-80

Prepared by
Trudy W. Banta
Judith A. Boser

February, 1981

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Bureau of Educational Research and Service
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
2046 Terrace Avenue
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916

CE 028 185

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Banta

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DISCLAIMER

This project is funded in part under an agreement with the Tennessee State Department of Education. However, points of view or opinions expressed do not necessarily represent policies or positions of the Tennessee State Department of Education.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

EEO/Title IX/Section 504 Statement

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville does not discriminate on the basis of race, sex, color, religion, national origin, age, handicap, or veteran status in provision of educational opportunities or employment opportunities and benefits.

UTK does not discriminate on the basis of sex or handicap in the education programs and activities which it operates, pursuant to the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Pub. L. 92-318; and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Pub. L. 93-112; resepectively. This policy extends to both employment by and admission to the University.

Inquiries concerning Title IX and Section 504 should be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration, 525 Andy Holt Tower, 974-4391. Charges of violation of the above policy should also be directed to the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION	1
CONGRUENCE BETWEEN IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND STATE OBJECTIVES.	1
LIMITATIONS	2
ORGANIZATION OF EVALUATION REPORT	2
SECTION 2. ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION ACTIVITIES OF STATE COORDINATOR.	3
SECTION 3. ADVISORY COUNCIL	5
SECTION 4. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS	11
SECTION 5. BIAS/STEREOTYPING WORKSHOP	19
SECTION 6. COUNSELOR WORKSHOPS.	23
SECTION 7. CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL.	25
INTRODUCTION.	25
CAREER EDUCATION ASSESSMENT	25
GENERAL SESSION SPEAKERS.	29
MINI SESSIONS	30
SECTION 8. FINAL REPORTS FROM LOCAL PROJECTS.	41
IDENTIFICATION OF PROJECTS.	41
PRIOR NEEDS ASSESSMENT DATA	41
PROJECT ORGANIZATION AND SUPPORT.	42
NEEDS ASSESSMENTS CONDUCTED DURING 1979-80.	46
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	46
OTHER PROJECT ACTIVITIES.	51
PROJECT EVALUATIONS	51
FUNDING AND EXPENDITURES.	55
RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PROJECT REPORTS.	55
ACHIEVEMENT OF STATE OBJECTIVES THROUGH LOCAL PROJECT ACTIVITIES.	62

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont.)

PAGE

SECTION 9. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 65

SUMMARY 65

Needs Assessment 65

Leadership/Coordination Activities 65

State Advisory Council 65

Technical Assistance Workshops 66

Workshop on Bias/Stereotyping. 66

Workshops for Counselors 66

Career Education Festival. 66

Final Reports from Local Projects. 66

RECOMMENDATIONS 68

Objectives 68

Involvement of Teacher Preparation Institutions. 69

Advisory Council 69

Evaluation 69

Project Selection. 70

Proposal Guidelines. 70

EVALUATION OF TENNESSEE'S STATE PLAN FOR CAREER EDUCATION

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

In the final month of operation for Tennessee's 1979-80 State Plan for Career Education, the Bureau of Educational Research and Service at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville was awarded a contract by the Tennessee Department of Education to conduct an external evaluation of the leadership activities carried out in support of the State Plan.

Congruence Between Identified Needs and State Objectives

In the year prior to the writing of the 1979-80 State Plan the evaluation director conducted a state-wide needs assessment which included a mail survey of a stratified random sample of Tennessee's superintendents, principals, teachers and community leaders. Both school personnel and community leaders provided a strong indication that they considered career education goals to be compatible with their own ideas about what should be going on in the State's schools.

When superintendents, principals, teachers and community leaders were presented with a set of career education goals and objectives for students and asked how much emphasis each should be given in the curriculum of the local schools, an average of 96 percent of all respondents said that all the objectives deserved "some" or "much" emphasis. No group was totally satisfied with the extent to which the student objectives were being achieved in the schools, however. Community leaders were least satisfied with the extent of achievement, but even among school staff 20 percent or more felt the career education objectives should be given more emphasis than the schools were achieving. Responses of superintendents, principals and teachers indicated that at most 60 percent of Tennessee's schools had attempted to implement career education in some way; and according to principals responding to the survey, only 20 percent had formal programs for infusing career education into the total curriculum.

Survey respondents indicated that the chief obstacle to implementation of career education programs was lack of funds. Lack of curriculum materials and resources for staff training were other critical problems. When asked what actions the State Department of Education could undertake to expedite career education implementation, all groups of respondents gave top priority to the provision of curriculum materials and staff training in career education.

Federal funds allocated to Tennessee under the provisions of PL 95-207 have helped to alleviate the principal career education need identified by survey respondents. The following objectives contained in the 1979-80 State Plan provide clear evidence that the critical needs for staff training and provision of curriculum materials have been addressed by developers of the plan:

Goal A

- Objective 2.4 Provision of staff development activities for Central Office Personnel.
- Objective 2.5 Identification of consultants capable of providing staff development for LEAs.
- Objective 2.6 Dissemination to LEAs of a listing of such consultants.

Goal B

- Objective 1.1 Conduct of in-service institutes for LEA personnel.
- Objective 1.2 Conduct of training for local career education coordinators.
- Objective 1.5 Conduct of a state-wide leadership conference.
- Objective 1.6 Conduct of a state-wide conference involving education, government, private employers and community agencies.
- Objective 1.7 Conduct of a state-wide awareness session for representatives of teacher preparation programs.
- Objective 1.8 Conduct of regional workshops for counselors.

Goal C

- Objective 1.2 Provision of awareness sessions for local boards of education.
- Objective 2.4 Adoption or development of infused curriculum guides in basic skills.
- Objective 2.7 Establishment of career education resource centers.
- Objective 3.2 Purchase of instructional and career guidance materials.

Limitations

The limited time (three months, following the last month of project operation) specified for the evaluation of leadership activities handicapped the evaluators in three ways:

1) The evaluation could not be considered external in the strictest sense since all data-gathering instruments had been designed by others. There was no overall evaluation plan, so the fragments of data made available to the evaluators on a post hoc basis had to be patched together to form a sometimes less than coherent picture of leadership activities during 1979-80.
2) The evaluators were not able to attend a State Advisory Council meeting or visit a local project. Thus the State Coordinator was the only person associated with the project with whom the evaluators had face-to-face contact.
3) The evaluators were not able to provide the State Coordinator with management information based on evaluation findings throughout the project year.

The wisdom of designating only 15 percent of a relatively small base allocation for state-wide leadership activities in a state as geographically spread out as Tennessee is questionable. The State Coordinator needed all of her limited leadership funds for programming and travel. She is to be commended for her efficiency in saving for purposes of funding an external evaluation even the small amount which eventually was awarded.

Organization of Evaluation Report

The evaluation report contains nine sections. The first is an introduction, the last a summary and list of recommendations. Each of the seven intervening sections includes an assessment of one of the elements of the State Plan:

Section 2. Administration/Coordination Activities of State Coordinator
Section 3. Advisory Council
Section 4. Technical Assistance Workshops
Section 5. Bias/Stereotyping Workshop
Section 6. Counselor Workshops
Section 7. Career Education Festival
Section 8. Final Reports from Local Projects

SECTION 2

ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION ACTIVITIES OF STATE COORDINATOR

Evaluation of the accomplishment of some of the State Career Education Coordinator's activities was based primarily or solely on information supplied to the evaluators by the Coordinator herself through verbal or written communications or through her final report.

In the area of administration and coordination for the planning and evaluation of career education within the State (Goal A), dates cited in the final report verified that:

- .the State Plan met the requirements of PL95-207 (Subgoal A1),
- .the State Plan had been implemented in accordance with State and Federal regulations (Subgoal A2) with the exception that the list of consultants was not yet finalized for distribution to LEAs (this was accomplished during January 1981, however), and
- .a time-line for project activities had been developed (Subgoal A3).

In providing leadership and coordination for the awareness and promotion of career education within the State (Goal B), one activity was deferred--involvement of teacher preparation institutions in a one-day awareness session (Subgoal B1). The Career Education Advisory Council was organized as specified and appropriately utilized in the development, implementation, and revision of the State Plan (Subgoal B2).

Several objectives included in the State Plan specified a criterion against which to judge success of implementation. The criterion was, in most cases, the percentage of local projects accomplishing the objective. The State Coordinator's review of local projects in her final report indicated that the criterion level specified for 1979-80 was reached for all criterion-based administration/coordination objectives (see Table 1).

With respect to her administration/coordination objectives, the Career Education Coordinator's efforts met or exceeded criteria set for her objectives in all except two activities--one of which was in progress at the end of the project year and the other of which had been initiated but delayed in order to achieve greater effectiveness. The participation of local projects in achieving the stated objectives reflected the extent to which the Coordinator made local project directors aware of the need to exert their own energies to promote career education.

TABLE 1
ACCOMPLISHMENT OF STATE COORDINATOR'S CRITERION-
BASED ADMINISTRATION/COORDINATION OBJECTIVES

Objective	Subgoal	Per Cent of Projects Accomplishing the Objective 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100
Sent representative to workshop on bias/stereotyping	A4	----------> **********
Sent State Department the results of a local needs assessment	B1	----------> **********
Sent from the local Board of Education a policy statement or letter of support for Career Education to the State Department of Education	C1	----------> **********
Had local plans reviewed by district team of Career Education Specialists	C1	----------> **********
Provided training for part or fulltime career education coordinator employed by participating system	C2	----------> **********
Developed a curriculum guide in a basic skill area	C2	-----> *********

Legend
-------> Criterion Level
******** Level of accomplishment

SECTION 3

ADVISORY COUNCIL

The establishment and operation of the State Advisory Council were responsibilities of the State Career Education Coordinator. How, when, and if the Council functioned were at the discretion of the Coordinator. The stated role of the Advisory Council in Tennessee was to provide "advice and assistance to the State Coordinator on matters related to management and implementation of the State Plan for Career Education."

The Coordinator related impressions about the functioning of the State Advisory Council, but it was felt by the evaluators that views of the Council members themselves should be obtained. While it would have been preferable to meet with the Council members to determine their perceptions of the functioning of the Council, this was not possible due to financial limitations and to the fact that the Council was not scheduled to meet prior to the time the evaluation was to be completed. Information was obtained from State Advisory Council members by means of a survey conducted by mail in December 1980.

Replies were received from 19 of the 24 Advisory Council members. Table 2 contains a summary of members' responses. Council members indicated that in general the State Coordinator's objectives had been met. Council members, almost without exception, supported the stated role of the State Advisory Council and felt that it accurately described the role they had played during 1979-80.

In addition to reviewing proposals, Council members actively participated in developing goals and objectives, establishing time lines, making decisions, and reviewing and revising the State Plan (84% or more of those responding indicated such involvement.). Ten of 17 (59%) respondents reported that they had been actively involved in disseminating the State Plan to local education agencies, while 10 of 18 Council members responding (56%) reported having actively participated in publicizing career education activities on a local or regional basis.

The mean effectiveness rating given the Advisory Council by the members was 7.7 on a 9-point scale, with 9 defined as "Very Effective", 5 as "Ineffective", and 1 as "Detrimental".

Council members expressed positive assessments of the guidelines used for reviewing proposals (mean=6.6 on a 9-point scale where 9="Very Good", 5="Adequate", and 1="Very Poor"). The State Coordinator indicated that some dissatisfaction had been expressed and that efforts to revise the guidelines had already been undertaken.

Comments on the survey form indicated that in general Advisory Council members endorsed the way in which the Council functioned during 1979-80. Two suggestions, each of which was offered by more than one person, were for regional meetings and for more meetings and/or more time to meet (Item 10).

The members of the Advisory Council seemed to feel that they had been effective in fulfilling the role assigned to them and that the role was the appropriate one for the State Advisory Council. Few changes were suggested.

In most respects the State Advisory Council functioning was consistent with the relevant Subgoals (A3 and B2) and often exceeded the criterion levels which had been established. Subgoal B2 was specific with reference to various functions of the Advisory Council. Members reported that the Council did function in accordance with the stated objectives. Although 65% participation in reviewing proposals was the criterion, 18 of the 19 responding (94%) reported being involved in this activity. Ten of 18 publicized career education activities on a regional basis, greatly exceeding the three-member criterion. Ten of 17 Council members participated in the dissemination of the State Plan to LEAs (there was no stated percentage of Council members set as a criterion for this activity).

In summary, the State Coordinator established and operated an effective Advisory Council during 1979-80. The Advisory Council membership had only one recommendation for improvement: More Advisory Council meetings. If funds could be committed, more Council meetings should be held in 1980-81.

TABLE 2
RESPONSES TO ADVISORY COUNCIL SURVEY

ITEM	Yes	No	Total
The Tennessee Coordinator of Career Education, Mrs. Sadie Chandler, has defined the role of the Career Education Advisory Council as one of providing "advice and assistance to the State Coordinator on matters related to management and implementation of the State Plan for Career Education."			
1. As a member of the Career Education Advisory Council, do you agree that this should be the role of the Advisory Council for Career Education in Tennessee? If not, please describe the role you think the Advisory Council should play. This is one role. In addition, to advise the State Board of Education on the direction, etc., of Career Education in Tennessee.	18	1	19
2. Does Mrs. Chandler's statement accurately describe the actual role of the Advisory Council during 1979-80? If not, how has the role actually played by the Advisory Council differed from that described above by the State Director of Career Education? Plus screening proposals, gave opinions and evaluation.	19	0	19
3. Did the Advisory Council actively participate in developing goals for the Tennessee State Plan for Career Education?	19	0	19
4. Did the Advisory Council actively participate in developing objectives for the Tennessee State Plan for Career Education?	18	1	19
5. Did the Advisory Council actively participate in establishing timelines for the Tennessee State Plan for Career Education?	16	3	19
6. Did the Advisory Council actively participate in disseminating the State Plan to LEAs?	10	7	17
7. Did the Advisory Council actively participate in decision-making?	16	3	19

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

	Yes	No	Total
What kinds of decisions should have been made by someone else, in your opinion?			
A panel of readers should be utilized on project proposals rather than advisory council members since some advisory council members submit proposals from their school system.			
This involvement seems at the correct level for decision-making.			
Only in an advisory capacity.			
8. Did the Advisory Council actively participate in reviewing and revising the State Plan for 1979-80?	16	3	19

9. On a scale of 1 to 9, rate the effectiveness of the Advisory Council (as a group) in developing, implementing, and revising the 1979-80 State Plan for Career Education in Tennessee.

	Detrimental				Ineffective			Very Effective	
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number							7	11	1

Mean=7.7

10. In what way(s) could the effectiveness of the Advisory Council be improved?

Opportunity to meet more often and subcommittee meetings.

Hearings could be held on a regional basis by the council to determine items of priority for career education. Findings could be reported to the State Board and be included in the revision of the State plan.

More time together.

Format to recognize and help expand efforts from all agencies.

Regional meetings

Develop a better instrument/method to evaluate proposals

In the future, more involvement in the review of existing project evaluations in order to make better decisions on upcoming proposals and dissemination of funds.

Possibly more time to meet so meetings would not need to be so long when we do meet.

Members of Council work well and hard together in minimum length of time to accomplish duties.

TABLE 2 (cont'd)

	Yes	No	Total
11. Were you involved in reviewing proposals?	18	1	19

How many proposals did you review?
18 all submitted
1 no

12. How would you rate the guidelines for reviewing proposals?

	Very Poor				Adequate				Very Good
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Number	1			2	1	2	7	4	2

Mean=6.6

13. Have you actively participated in publicizing Career Education activities on a local or regional basis?	10	8	18

SECTION 4

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS

During 1979 three regional-technical assistance workshops were planned and conducted by the State Career Education Coordinator to provide an overview of career education for LEAs and to assist them in understanding how to develop a proposal for a local career education project.

A total of 92 persons attended the three technical assistance workshops: 29 in East Tennessee, 24 in Middle Tennessee, and 39 in West Tennessee. Over 47% of the participants completed evaluation forms at the conclusion of their workshop.

The first 11 items on the evaluation form (See Table 3) pertained to characteristics of presenters/speakers, on which they were rated as truly outstanding; superior; good; fair, average; below average; poor. Almost without exception, the majority of participant responses to these items were positive. It should be noted that the rating categories provided greater differentiation in the positive direction than in the negative since there were three above-average options and only one below-average option.

Speakers/presenters were rated highest on knowledge of subject matter (Item 4), with 98% rating them as "superior" or "truly outstanding"; and lowest on flexibility and responsiveness to problems and needs of participants (Item 1), on which 36% rated them "good" or "fair." Respondents generally viewed the speakers/presenters as tolerant, interested in subject matter, having clear workshop objectives, agreeing between objectives and what was discussed, and keeping participants involved. Eighty-three percent of the respondents rated the overall conduct of workshop "superior" or "truly outstanding."

The second part of the evaluation form consisted of eight items that described aspects of the workshop other than the speakers/presenters. Responses to items in this section also were generally positive, although both workshop facilities (Item 17) and opportunity to interact with other workshop participants (Item 13) were not marked positively by 30 percent of the participants (See Table 3.).

Item 21 (See "Responses to Item 21") asked respondents to list one or two things done especially well in the workshop. The responses can be classified in three general categories: workshop organization, content, and presenters. Workshop organization was most frequently mentioned as one of the things done well. Discussion of the proposal was specifically mentioned by eight people, the handout materials and use of audiovisual materials by four each. The interest and enthusiasm of the speakers, the State Coordinator in particular, were also commended by the participants.

For Item 22 (See "Responses to Item 22"), "Comments or Suggestions", there was much less duplication of responses. Some positive comments reiterated those given in response to Item 21, particularly with reference to the organization for the workshop itself. Some suggestions could be applied to future projects (listing the site in advance publicity notices, having shorter sessions) while others were more relevant to the technical assistance workshop itself or to other workshops on the same topic.

Since there was not much duplication among responses to Item 22, there is little indication that many changes were desired by the participants. The responses to the whole evaluation instrument were primarily positive in nature and indicated participant approval of the way in which the technical assistance workshops were planned and carried out.

Through the technical assistance workshops, the State Department of Education provided technical assistance for the development of career education program proposals which subsequently received financial assistance (Subgoal C1). Perhaps more indicative of effectiveness than the positive tenor of the ratings given on the evaluation forms is the fact that of the eighteen workshop participants who developed and submitted proposals, all received funding. Three additional LEAs sought and received individual assistance from the State Coordinator to develop proposals which also received funding. The efforts of the State Coordinator with respect to Subgoal C1 were shown to be quite effective since LEAs that participated in the workshops and later developed career education program proposals were successful in their attempts to gain funding.

TABLE 3

PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO EVALUATIVE QUESTIONS CONCERNING TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORKSHOPS

	Truly Outstanding	Superior	Good	Fair Average	Below Average Poor	Missing
1. Flexibility and responsiveness to problems and needs of participants.	14%	50%	32%	4%		
2. Tolerance: Participants feel free to ask questions, disagree, express their ideas, etc.	34%	45%	16%	5%		
3. Interest in subject matter of workshop sessions.	41%	50%	9%			
4. Knowledge of subject matter of workshop sessions.	48%	50%	2%			
5. Organized presentation of materials and subject matter.	32%	50%	16%	2%		
6. Clarity of interpretations and explanations of subject matter.	23%	57%	20%			
7. Emphasis on important materials and subject matter.	18%	68%	14%			
8. Clarity of workshop objectives.	34%	55%	11%			
9. Agreement between objectives of the workshop and what was actually discussed.	32%	50%	18%			
10. Ability to keep me involved in workshop learning activities.	16%	50%	29%			5%
11. Overall conduct of workshop.	23%	59%	14%			

TABLE 3 (Continued)

(Response alternatives consisted of a series of faces with negative, neutral, and positive expressions)

	--	-	Neutral	+	++	Missing
12. Opportunity to participate in active learning.	2%		14%	52%	32%	
13. Opportunity to interact with other workshop participants.	2%	5%	23%	45%	25%	
14. Opportunity in interact with project staff.		5%	2%	57%	36%	
15. Advance information about workshop.		5%	14%	45%	34%	2%
16. Orientation during opening sessions.			9%	57%	34%	
17. Workshop facilities.			30%	38%	32%	
19. Organizational details.		2%	2%	64%	32%	
20. Usefulness of information.		2%	5%	45%	48%	

N = 44

Responses to Item 21

21. List or describe one or two things you thought were done especially well in this workshop.

Workshop Organization

Organization and timing of workshop - 12*

Handouts, resource materials - 4

Films, audio-visuals - 4

Structure and content

Content

Introduction of many facets of Career Education (overview) - 6

Definition of Career Education

Explanation of subject matter, forms - 3

Walking through proposal format - 2

Organization of application

Technical data

Specific information to include

Discussion of proposal preparation

Explaining state guide

Useful information - 3

Types of projects that can be funded

Sex stereotyping

What is being done elsewhere

Not giving a definite amount of money, especially to larger systems

Presenters

Guest speakers - 4

Presentations - 3

Willingness of staff to answer all questions - 2

Presenters (continued)

Sadie's presentation, enthusiasm - 2

Attitude of presenters - 2

Enthusiasm of staff - 2

Interest and enthusiasm of participants

*The number of participants giving this response if given by more than one person.

Responses to Item 22

22. List any comments or suggestions about workshop details.

Positive comments

Good overview

Well planned to meet needs of those present

Well organized and presented

Very positive

Sadie's enthusiasm

Good workshop

Good meeting

Presentations

Too much lecture, needed probing questions asked of participants to generate discussion and interaction

More direct answers about questions concerning career education and how to begin

Do not read objectives when presented on overhead, give important facts in own words

Organization and Facilities

More opportunity to interact with staff over proposal development

More time to talk with others in the group

Shorter sessions

Later starting time

Invite practitioner rather than only supervisors

More sales representatives to familiarize participants with existing career education materials

Better parking

The building in which the workshop was to be conducted should have been included in Advance Information Announcement

Content

The only new information was on project writing

More time on a more thorough study of the manual

Unsure about needs and objectives in the application

General

Amount of money suggested as a top limit caused our system to decide not to submit

The amount of money for salaries to put the plan together would exceed the grant

Added personnel needed

SECTION 5

BIAS/STEREOTYPING WORKSHOP

Leadership at the state level to sensitize project personnel and to initiate progress toward eliminating bias and stereotyping based on race, age, sex, economic status, handicap, and national origin was shown in the organization of a state-wide workshop. The workshop, entitled "Combating Sex, Age, Race and Handicap Bias/Stereotyping in Career Education", was conducted April 8, 1980 in Nashville under the joint sponsorship of the Tennessee Department of Education and the American Institute for Research (AIR).

Twenty-three of 46 individuals in attendance at the workshop completed an 18-item instrument prepared by AIR personnel both at the beginning of the workshop and at its conclusion as part of an effort to measure change in attitudes. The original presentation of data from the evaluation instrument compiled by AIR (See Table 4) listed pretest item frequencies and means independent of posttest item frequencies and means. The evaluators were not given sufficient information to determine whether the same 23 persons completed the instrument both times. Even if that were the case, there was no way of matching the responses of individuals given on the two occasions, which would have resulted in a greater chance of detecting significant changes than was possible when the two sets of data were considered to be unrelated. Another factor which cannot be overlooked is that respondents completed the same instrument on both occasions. Having taken the pretest may well have sensitized participants to items of content, causing them to attach greater importance to those items when presented and to remember them on the posttest.

The instrument consisted of five statements related to the disabled, five concerning sex differences, and four each focusing on the elderly and on racial differences. Each of the 18 items was rated on a five-point Likert scale with 1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree. The greatest change in rating was recorded on Item 4 ("There is relatively little in the women's movement for men."). From a pretest mean of 2.3, the posttest mean of 1.4 showed almost a full rating point gain in the direction of greater disagreement. Item 8 ("There is too little concern for the mental health of the elderly") increased by .80 from pretest to posttest, while increases of .70 were found for each of three statements: Item 3("The main point of the women's movement is to build trust and new kinds of partnerships among men and women"), Item 7 ("Educational opportunities are increasing for older people."), and Item 16 ("Schools still do not offer equal academic preparation to students of all races.").

Application of statistical tests to pretest and posttest scores (independent t-tests) for individual items showed significant changes for the five items previously listed and for Item 9 ("Older people are increasingly being seen as capable workers"), which evidenced an increase of .60.

Three of the four items related to the elderly manifested significant change, while none of the items related to bias due to handicapping conditions showed significant change. Whether this is a reflection of the emphasis given the various topics during the workshop, or the extent of previous knowledge in the various areas, cannot be determined from the results obtained by administering this instrument. The summary of instrument responses which was provided to the evaluators by AIR included no information regarding reliability or validity of the instrument, so it must be assumed that neither had been established.

Information supplied by the State Coordinator indicated that 75% of the funded projects (15/20) sent representatives to the bias/stereotyping workshop. This exceeded the criterion level of 60% stated in Subgoal A4 for 1979-80. In terms of effectiveness, analysis of pretest-posttest scores indicated a tendency toward reduction of bias and stereotyping behavior among participants, with the most noticeable changes occurring in the areas of age and sex discrimination.

TABLE 4 (Continued)

	Pretest[a]							Posttest[a]								
		Total							Total							
	n	1	2	3	4	5	$\bar{x}$	n	1	2	3	4	5	$\bar{x}$	Diff.	p
Disabled individuals tend to miss a lot of work.	22	14	6	0	1	1	1.6	21	17	2	2	0	0	1.3	-.3	
Disabled people do not have equal job opportunities.	22	2	1	2	11	6	3.8	21	1	1	2	9	8	4.0	+.2	
Race discrimination on the job is less of a problem than in the past.	23	2	3	5	10	3	3.4	22	2	5	4	7	4	3.3	-.1	
Schools still do not offer equal academic preparation to students of all races.	23	4	4	7	7	1	2.9	23	0	2	9	8	4	3.6	+.7	.021
Race is still a factor in career tracking of students.	23	1	4	5	11	2	3.4	22	1	1	5	12	3	3.7	+.3	
Schools have lessened race stereotyping substantially in recent years.	23	0	1	6	14	2	3.7	23	1	2	8	10	2	3.4	-.3	

[a]Respondents rated each item on a five-part scale; 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree.

[b]Two-tailed probabilities for independent t-test significant beyond .05.

TABLE 4 (Continued)

	Pretest[a]							Posttest[a]								
	n	1	2	3	4	5	Total $\bar{x}$	n	1	2	3	4	5	Total $\bar{x}$	Diff.	p
Disabled individuals tend to miss a lot of work.	22	14	6	0	1	1	1.6	21	17	2	2	0	0	1.3	-.3	
Disabled people do not have equal job opportunities.	22	2	1	2	11	6	3.8	21	1	1	2	9	8	4.0	+.2	
Race discrimination on the job is less of a problem than in the past.	23	2	3	5	10	3	3.4	22	2	5	4	7	4	3.3	-.1	
Schools still do not offer equal academic preparation to students of all races.	23	4	4	7	7	1	2.9	23	0	2	9	8	4	3.6	+.7	.021
Race is still a factor in career tracking of students.	23	1	4	5	11	2	3.4	22	1	1	5	12	3	3.7	+.3	
Schools have lessened race stereotyping substantially in recent years.	23	0	1	6	14	2	3.7	23	1	2	8	10	2	3.4	-.3	

[a] Respondents rated each item on a five-part scale; 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree.

[b] Two-tailed probabilities for independent t-test significant beyond .05.

SECTION 6

COUNSELOR WORKSHOPS

Three regional career education workshops were sponsored for counselors by the State Department of Education in an attempt to further develop their knowledge about career education. Attendance was 40 in Middle Tennessee on November 16, 1979 at Murfreesboro; 51 at Reelfoot Lake Park on November 16-17, 1979 for East Tennessee; and 52 at the West Tennessee workshop, which was conducted February 15-16, 1980 at Maryville. Topics presented to the 143 counselors who attended the three workshops included sex equality, activities to eliminate stereotyping, and career education assessment and techniques. Although evaluation activities were conducted, no data were made available to the State Coordinator or to the evaluators.

Evaluation might have provided some insight into the lack of attendance at the counselor workshops. Since not all funds available to pay expenses for participants were expended, cost to participants was not a likely cause for lack of attendance. In order to determine why the Coordinator's criterion level of participation by 25% of the State's approximately 1,000 counselors was not reached, some type of follow-up would have been necessary. Since this activity was not to be continued in the State Plan, there seems little point in further investigation at this time.

SECTION 7

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

Introduction

A state-wide leadership conference, the Career Education Festival, was organized and conducted by the State Career Education Coordinator to provide information about funded projects in the State; to inform conferees about current developments in career education on the national level; and to stimulate greater involvement of other LEAs, community agencies and professional organizations in career education in Tennessee.

The Career Education Festival was sponsored by the Tennessee Department of Education on July 15, 16, and 17, 1980 at Gatlinburg, Tennessee. One hundred and fifty persons attended. In addition to speakers on general career education topics, 19 of the 20 funded state projects shared information about their projects. Three types of evaluation were utilized during the Career Education Festival: A "Pre-conference/Post-conference Assessment", individual mini-session rating forms, and evaluation of the general session speakers.

Career Education Assessment

Participants were asked to complete a checklist (the "Pre-conference/ Post-conference Assessment") that contained ten items designed to indicate whether they felt they possessed adequate or inadequate knowledge with reference to various workshop objectives. Nine people checked each item on both pre- and post-conference bases, while an additional eight responded only in terms of pre-conference knowledge. Those who checked pre- and post-conference knowledge did so on the same form. The total of 17 represents 11% of those attending, although it cannot be determined how many of the total of 150 were present throughout the Festival.

According to the responses received, the greatest lack of information before the conference was in knowing where career education projects were in operation in Tennessee (Item 8), on which 10 of the 17 participants felt their knowledge was inadequate (see Table 5). In contrast, only two people initially felt they could not adequately define career education (Item 1). Six of the 17 felt they lacked sufficient knowledge to use the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a reference to identify jobs (Item 3). Of the ten items, only Items 8 and 3 were checked by one-third or more of the participants as those about which they had insufficient knowledge. If the ten items represented the objectives of the Festival, the pre-conference data indicated that a different audience might have gained more from the Festival than the one that attended.

Those who completed the Pre-conference Assessment represented various groups and levels of knowledge. Among the participants who responded were three teachers, three counselors, three project directors, three state department employees, two advisory council members, one local educational agency representative, one county representative, and one higher education representative. Two of the project directors, two state department employees, and one advisory council member indicated that they felt they had adequate knowledge on all items before the conference. The needs of the others, by position, are presented in Table 6. Although the numbers were too small to be representative, information of this type would be helpful in planning future conferences with regard to which populations to serve and what needs to address.

On the Post-conference Assessment the only item for which all nine participants checked "adequate knowledge" was Item 7 (offering suggestions to teachers for implementing career education activities). One person did not

Table 5

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL
PRE-CONFERENCE/POST-CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT
KNOWLEDGE OF GOALS

	Pre-conference Knowledge (n=17)		Post-conference Knowledge (n=9)		
	Adequate	Inadequate	Adequate	Inadequate	Missing
1. Adequately define Career Education.	15	2	8		1
2. Design appropriate learning experiences for career education activities.	12	5	8	1	
3. Use the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a reference to identify jobs.	11	6	6	3	
4. Offer suggestions to teachers for implementing career education activities.	13	4	9		
5. Identify the 15 Occupational Clusters defined by U.S.O.E.	12	5	8	1	
6. Compile a resource file of persons who might be willing to share an occupational experience.	13	4	5	2	1
7. Assist in designing hands on activities which involve the student directly in learning experiences.	12	5	7	1	1
8. Know where Career Education projects are in operation in Tennessee.	7	10	8		1
9. Aware of current literature and attitudes about the changing role of women and men in the work force and the home.	13	4	8		1
10. Assist in designing values classification activities for students based on the premise that individuals differ in their interests, abilities, attitudes and values.	13	4	7	1	1

Table 6

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

PRE-CONFERENCE/POST-CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT
RESPONSES BY POSITION OF RESPONDENT

PRE TEST

	Number	Number indicating inadequacy	Number indicating inadequate knowledge by item									
			Item									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teacher	3	3		2	3	2	3	1	1	3	1	1
Counselor	3	3	1	1		1		2	1	3	1	1
Project Director	3	1	1	1					1	1		
State Department Employee	3	1			1		1		1		1	
Advisory Council	2	1			1							
Higher Education	1	1				1			1	1	1	1
County Representative	1	1		1				1		1		1
Local Educational Agency	1	1			1		1			1		
TOTAL	17	12	2	5	6	4	5	4	5	10	4	4

POST-TEST

	Number	Number indicating inadequacy	Number indicating inadequate knowledge by item									
			ITEM									
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teacher	3	2		1	2		1	1	1			
Counselors	2	0										
Advisory Council	2	0										
County Representative	1	1						1				1
State Department Employee	1	1			1		1					
TOTAL	9	5	0	1	3	0	1	2	1	0	0	1

respond to Item 1 (adequately define career education), but all eight who did respond felt they had adequate knowledge. One-third (3 of 9) still felt inadequate in using the Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a reference to identify jobs (Item 3), so that the percentage of those who felt a need in this respect remained about the same at the end as at the beginning of the conference.

Of those who completed both Pre- and Post-conference Assessments and indicated feelings of inadequacy on one or more items on the Pre-assessment, 62 percent expressed feelings of adequacy on the Post-assessment (See Table 7).

Table 7

PARTICIPANTS' CHANGE AND LACK OF CHANGE DURING CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

Item	Pre-conference Inadequate-Post-conference Adequate	Pre-conference Inadequate-Post-conference Inadequate
1	0	0
2	2	1
3	2	3
4	2	0
5	2	1
6	0	3
7	0	1
8	6	0
9	1	0
10	1	1
TOTAL	16	10

N=9

Use of a binomial test for significance shows that the overall difference is not significant if the probability of change were 0 = .50, p = .1587). It should be noted, however, that all six participants who checked Item 8 as "inadequate" before the Festival gained competence. In contrast, none of the three who checked Item 6 as "inadequate" improved during the Festival to the point of feeling "adequate".

There is no way to determine which (or how many) Festival activities were attended by each of the participants. Therefore, what each learned or failed to learn may be due, in part, to their own selection of activities at the Festival.

The assessment instrument itself contained some items which related to specific knowledge and information, such as the use of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (Item 3), identifying the 15 occupational clusters (Item 5), knowing where career education projects were in Tennessee (Item 8), awareness of current literature and attitudes about the changing role of women and men in the work force and the home (Item 9). Other items represented knowledge of a "how to" nature: design appropriate learning experiences for career education activities (Item 2), offer suggestions to teachers for implementing career education activities (Item 4), compile a resource file of persons who might be willing to share an occupational experience (Item 6), assist in designing hands-on activities which involve the student directly in learning experiences (Item 7), assist in designing values classification (sic) activities for students based on the premise that individuals differ in their interests, abilities, attitudes and values (Item 10).

The relatively small number of people who completed the assessment instrument weakened the impact of any information derived from it. A pre-test/post-test design can be useful in determining the effectiveness of a program if it can be determined that the instrument measures changes which are likely to occur because of the program. With respect to two of the items (3 and 6), there might be some question as to the appropriateness of including them in the instrument since hoped-for changes did not occur in the percentages of people who felt knowledgeable in regard to them. There should be a correspondence between items on the evaluation instrument and stated objectives. Overall, the post-test results were positive, however many of those attending felt adequate before the conference.

The assessment forms were distributed during the first session and at registration. There was no control over when participants completed the forms, however, so it is possible that data coded as "Pre-conference" or "Post-conference" may have been marked at the same time. In addition, participants who submitted both Pre- and Post-conference data did so on the same form.

In light of these facts, any evidence of change obtained on this instrument is questionable since it cannot be determined when "Pre-Conference" and "Post-conference" Assessments were done by the individuals.

General Session Speakers

A total of 20 participants rated one or more of the four general sessions at the Career Education Festival. Included among the 20 were four counselors, two teachers, two advisory council members, three local education agency staff members, one project director, one state department employee, one librarian, and one county representative (see Table 8). The four general session programs included: an address by Dr. Sam Betances on the opening day, banquet speaker Dr. Sidney High, a panel discussion on the final day moderated by Carol Thigpen, and luncheon speaker Dr. Edward C. Mann. Evaluations of the four programs were completed by 19, 17, 16, and 14 people, respectively (see Table 9). Each program was evaluated individually on six items, and all four program evaluations were listed on a single form.

There were no negative ratings of Dr. Betances' presentation. Dr. Mann's address was not rated as positively, particularly with respect to Items 4 and 5 ("I was stimulated to think about the topic presented" and "The session met my expectations.") Unsolicited comments indicated Dr. Mann's speech was thought to be too long, applicable for those not already knowledgeable, and that he lacked knowledge of his audience.

Dr. High's banquet address was rated lower than Dr. Mann's on the same two items (4 and 5), although both speakers were seen as well informed on the subject (Item 3) and the content they presented was applicable to the development of career education (Item 6).

The panel discussion was rated positively, with the lowest mean being that of 4.0, which corresponds to "Agree" on the 5-point scale that was used.

A concluding comment by one participant stated that "most speakers contributed no new ideas, just a rehashing of ideas and information which is common knowledge among those of us involved in career education."

General reactions to the main speakers were positive, however the small number of completed evaluations is consistent with the other evaluation results from the Festival.

Mini Sessions

Reports on 19 of the 20 projects were presented during each of two different 30-minute time periods on Wednesday, July 16. Evaluation forms were provided so that those attending could complete a rating form for each mini session attended.

Seven of the 19 projects submitted no rating forms for either of their two sessions, three projects submitted one form, and three other projects submitted two forms (see Table 10). Of the 19 projects participating, only three submitted a total of ten or more rating forms for both sessions (Projects 12, 13, and 15). An additional three project directors turned in five or seven forms each (Projects 3, 4, and 8).

In general, the ratings given the mini sessions were favorable (see Table 10). Items 6 and 11 were worded so that a favorable rating was indicated by "Strongly Disagree" while all other items were favorable if the participants agreed with the items. The highest percentage of disagreement or unfavorable sentiment occurred on Item 9 (This session met my expectations), but even in this case, only nine percent of the participants indicated unfavorable reactions to the sessions.

Responses on the rating forms indicated that the presenters were relatively successful with respect to the 14 evaluation items (See Table 11). However, the low number of forms submitted leaves some question as to the extent to which the respondents represented the diversity of the group of participants who attended the sessions. The number of ratings probably is primarily a measure of the conscientiousness of the presenter in encouraging people to turn them in and bears little relationship to actual attendance.

In general, results of the evaluations carried out for the Festival were positive. There seems little doubt that it was a positive, constructive experience for those who participated. However, while various specific aspects of the Festival were targeted for evaluation as well as the overall project, the same low response rate characterizes all three evaluation efforts. It is unfortunate that the time and effort spent in planning the evaluation and preparing the forms did not produce enough data upon which to formulate conclusions which could be considered representative of the group.

The collection of evaluation data needs to be more systematic, and evaluation instruments must be designed in light of stated objectives. If a pre-test/post-test instrument is to be used, care must be exercised to insure that data are collected at the appropriate times.

Information from the State Coordinator indicate that all but one of the funded projects (95%) attended the conference. This considerably exceeded the 65% target established in Subgoal B1. The Career Education Festival, or a similar event, seems to have great potential for providing a stimulus for career education in Tennessee if more people, particularly those not already involved in funded projects, could be reached. Comments from participants indicated that presentations were good and would have been helpful for others, but those involved in funded projects were relatively well acquainted with the topics presented.

Table 8

GENERAL SESSION SPEAKERS

Participants Completing Evaluation Forms

Counselors	4
Local Educational Agency Staff	3
Project Director	1
State Department Employee	1
Librarian	1
Advisory Council Member	2
Teacher	2
County Representative	1
Unknown	4
TOTAL	19

TABLE 9

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

General Session Evaluations

1. JULY 15, 1980
MAIN ADDRESS
DR. SAM BETANCES

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session were clear.	14	5				4.74
2. The purposes of the session were realistic.	17	2				4.90
3. The presenter was well informed on the subject.	18	1				4.90
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	17	2				4.89
5. The session met my expectations.	17	1	1			4.84
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	17	1	1			4.84

N = 19

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

General Session Evaluations (continued)

II. JULY 16, 1980
BANQUET: MAIN ADDRESS
DR. SIDNEY HIGH

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session were clear.	6	8	2	1		4.12
2. The purposes of the session were realistic.	5	8	3	1		4.0
3. The presenter was well informed on the subject.	10	7				4.59
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented	2	5	3	6	1	3.06
5. The session met my expectations.	2		6	7	2	2.47
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	6	8	2			4.25

N = 17

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

General Session Evaluations (continued)

III. JULY 17, 1980
PANEL DISCUSSION
CAROL THIGPEN, MODERATOR

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session were clear.	9	7				4.56
2. The purposes of the session were realistic.	8	7	1			4.44
3. The panel members were well informed on the subject.	11	4	1			4.63
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	6	8		2		4.13
5. The session met my expectations.	3	11	1	1		4.0
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	8	8				4.5

N = 16

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

General Session Evaluations (continued)

IV. JULY 17, 1980
LUNCHEON
DR. EDWARD C. MANN

	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Undecided (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	Mean*
1. The objectives of the session was clear.	7	4	3			4.29
2. The purpose of the session were realistic.	6	4	4			4.14
3. The presenter was well informed on the subject.	8	4	1	1		4.36
4. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	2	6	3	1	1	3.54
5. The session met my expectations.	2	7	3	1	1	3.57
6. The content presented was applicable to the development of career education.	6	7	1			4.36

N = 14

* High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating.

TABLE 10

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

Mean Ratings by Item for Mini Sessions

Project[a]	N[b]	ITEM 1. The objectives of the session were clear to me.	2. The purpose of this session were realistic.	3. The material presented was valuable to me.	4. The Presenter was well informed on the subject.	5. I was stimulated to think about the topic presented.	6. The information presented was too theoretical.	7. This presenter related theory to practice.	8. This session followed a logical and appropriate pattern.	9. This session met my expectations.	10. I have in mind a plan for future action.	11. The information presented was too advanced.	12. The content presented was applicable to development of Career Education.	13. Reference materials provided were appropriate.	14. This session will help me assist teachers in designing career education activities for students.
3	7	4.29	4.29	3.71	4.29	3.86	1.71*	3.71	4.0	3.71	4.14	2.14*	4.29	3.57	3.71
4	5	4.5	4.6	4.2	4.4	4.6	1.8*	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.0	1.6*	4.2	4.4	4.4
7	1	4.0	2.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	2.0*	2.0	3.0	2.0		3.0*	4.0	1.0	1.0
8	5	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.6	4.5	2.6*	3.8	4.2	4.0	4.2	2.4*	4.6	4.2	4.2
9	1	4.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0*	2.0	2.0	1.0		1.0*	2.0	1.0	2.0
10	1	4.0	4.0	5.0	5.0	4.0	2.0*	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0*	4.0	4.0	4.0
11	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	1.5*	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5	1.5*	4.5	4.5	4.0
12	12	4.08	3.92	3.83	4.58	3.83	2.45*	3.45	4.17	3.75	4.33	2.0*	4.17	4.08	3.58
13	15	4.47	4.67	4.5	4.8	4.67	1.86*	4.6	4.47	4.53	4.0	1.6*	4.67	4.0	4.2
14	2	4.5	4.5	4.0	4.5	4.5	1.2*	4.5	4.0	3.0	3.0	1.5*	4.5	4.0	3.0
15	10	4.4	4.4	4.1	4.6	4.2	1.78*	3.88	4.33	4.11	3.89	2.0*	4.4	3.75	4.38
16	3	4.67	5.0	4.33	5.0	4.67	1.33*	4.33	4.33	5.0	3.67	1.33*	4.67	4.0	4.0
20	2	4.5	4.5	4.5	5.0	4.5	1.5*	4.5	5.0	4.5	3.5	1.5*	5.0	4.5	3.5

*High mean (near 5) indicates favorable rating except for items 6 and 11.

[a]See accompanying list of projects.

[b]Number of completed rating forms.

TABLE 11

CAREER EDUCATION FESTIVAL

MINI-SESSION RATINGS

(OVERALL PERCENTAGES)

Item **	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Missing
1	38	56	5			1
2	45	45	5	5		
3	35	47	11	6		1
4	61	37	1	1		
5	41	44	8	6		1
6*	6	1	5	51	32	5
7	25	56	8	6		5
8	38	50	8	3		1
9	36	44	9	6	3	2
10	23	51	20	1		5
11*	5	3	5	48	39	
12	50	45	3	2		
13	21	50	17	1	3	8
14	22	50	20	6	1	1

N = 66

* Strongly disagree is favorable response.

** See preceding page for items corresponding to item numbers.

List of Projects

1. Alcoa/Maryville/Blount
2. Anderson
3. Claiborne
4. Cleveland
5. Greeneville
6. Humboldt
7. Huntington
8. Knoxville
9. Nashville
10. Oak Ridge
11. Overton
12. Putnam
13. Rhea
14. Scott
15. Shelby
16. South Carroll
17. Trenton
18. Washington
19. Wayne
20. Wilson/Lebanon/Watertown

SECTION 8

FINAL REPORTS FROM LOCAL PROJECTS

Identification of Projects

Twenty local projects were funded in Tennessee under provisions of the Career Education Incentive Act (PL95-207). The participating school systems were:

1. Alcoa/Maryville/Blount County
2. Anderson County
3. Claiborne County
4. Cleveland
5. Greeneville City Schools
6. Humboldt
7. Huntingdon
8. Knoxville City Schools
9. Metro Nashville/Davidson County
10. Oak Ridge City Schools
11. Overton County
12. Putnam County
13. Rhea County
14. Scott County
15. Shelby County
16. South Carroll
17. Trenton
18. Washington County
19. Wayne County
20. Wilson/Lebanon/Watertown

A complete final project report consisted of a structured checklist, a narrative section, and a financial report. All 20 project directors submitted a financial report, 17 submitted the checklist, and 17 provided the narrative section. While Project 5 did not include the checklist, and Project 19 did not contain a narrative section, in some cases it was possible to infer responses for one section from those included in the other. Thus many of the findings in the paragraphs which follow were based on data from 18 of 20 local projects.

Prior Needs Assessment Data

As part of the proposal submitted for the funding competition each local education agency was asked to provide data from a prior needs assessment which could be used as the basis for local project objectives. One-third of the 18 project proposals reviewed contained no objective needs assessment data, just the proposal writer's opinions about local needs.

The dozen project proposals which did show evidence of data collection for the purpose of establishing need employed a variety of needs assessment strategies:

- needs assessment surveys of students and school staff, parents and community representatives

- needs identification and priority-setting by school board or local career education advisory council
- calculation of dropout or suspension rate
- follow-up surveys of high school graduates
- pretests of career education knowledge and attitudes for school staff
- state proficiency test scores

Eleven of the 12 proposals citing objective needs assessment data focused first on the needs of students. Student needs most often identified included information designed to:

- increase self-understanding
- acquaint students with the vast variety of careers available
- increase appreciation for the value of work, the interdependency of jobs
- increase awareness of the relationship between basic skills and their application in the world of work
- improve use of leisure time
- enhance decision-making skills
- impart job-seeking skills
- increase participation in part time employment.

In order to provide for the student needs, seven proposals contained the suggestion that the school curriculum be infused with career education concepts. In order to prepare staff properly to perform infusion, staff development and career education materials were needed. These two basic needs identified by local proposal developers in 1979 were the same as those identified more than a year earlier by the evaluation director in her State-wide career education needs assessment.

Project Organization and Support

Eight of Tennessee's local career education projects employed a career education coordinator on a full-time or part-time basis (see Table 12). Sixteen of 17 reports indicated that a local advisory council had been established to give assistance and direction to the project. The councils consisted of from 7 to 33 members, with an average membership of 18 (see Table 13). Groups most frequently represented on the advisory councils were business and industrial representatives and parents (15 projects each), educators (14 projects), and labor (11 projects).

Fourteen of the reports listed a total of 382 groups which had cooperated with the school system in implementing or maintaining career education efforts (see Table 14). Part of this large total was due to the listing provided by Project 2, which included approximately 200 co-op businesses. In addition to this one large listing, 60 business and industrial groups, 48 government agencies, 27 civic groups, 25 educational institutions (public and private) and 22 professional organizations were involved in career education across Tennessee during 1979-80. Project 3 did not cite specific groups but reported cooperation from the total community. The actual numbers of persons involved could not be calculated since one group might have included many individuals representing different organizations. It is noteworthy that only three projects that completed the report reported no community involvement.

TABLE 12

SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM COMPONENTS

Activity	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total	Percent of All Projects
Employed career education coordinator		✓				✓	✓	✓				✓	✓				✓	✓	8	40
Established career research center		✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	14	70
Purchased career education materials	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	17	85
Provided work experiences for students for purpose of career exploration	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓					✓					9	45
Established comprehensive career guidance program	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓		✓		13	65
Conducted career education needs assessment during current school year	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	14	70
Has conducted career education needs assessment within past two years		✓				✓		✓	✓	✓		✓			✓		✓		8	40
Has schools in the system who were involved in 1978 statewide needs assessment						✓	✓	✓		✓							✓		5	25
Conducted an evaluation of career education efforts during current year	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	17	85
School Board has adopted career education as a goal or as a policy statement		✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓		✓	✓			✓	11	55
System has a career education plan	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16	80
Obtained television time to share information about career education program																			0	0
Obtained time on radio	✓				✓		✓						✓	✓				✓	6	30
Has a local advisory committee for career education	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	16	80

TABLE 13. CAREER EDUCATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

	PROJECT															
	1	2	3	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20
Number of persons representing business and industry	2	11	1	3	5	7	1		2	4	5	2	3	5	6	6
Persons representing labor	11	1	1	2	1	2				1		1		2	1	3
Persons representing parents	1		2	9	2	5	1	11	1	1		1	6	9	10	2
Persons representing educators	5	2	2	5	5	10	8		7		11	13	5	4	14	2
Persons representing other groups	8	1	1	7	3	3	1		4		6	1	2	10	2	2
TOTAL	17	15	7	26	16	27	11	11	14	6	22	18	16	30	33	15

TABLE 14. TYPES AND NUMBERS OF GROUPS COOPERATING WITH THE SCHOOL SYSTEM IN IMPLEMENTING OR MAINTAINING CAREER EDUCATION EFFORTS

GROUP	PROJECT														
	1	2	5	6	8	9	10	12	14	15	16	17	19	20	TOTAL
Civic groups	3	1		3	1	5	2	1			1	3		5	27
Professional groups	1	3		4	3						1	6		4	22
Government agencies	5		2	4	2	1			2	11	3	8	7	3	48
Business/Industry		200	16	5	1	6		1		22	4	4	1		260
Educational institutions	2		5		2	1				9	3		1		25
TOTAL	11	204	23	16	9	13	2	2	2	42	14	21	9	12	382

Needs Assessments Conducted During 1979-80

Sixteen projects reported conducting one or more needs assessments during 1979-80 (see Table 15). The groups most often surveyed were counselors (16 projects), teachers and administrators (15 projects each), others (9 projects), students (7 projects), and parents (5 projects). Consistent with the conclusion reached in prior needs assessments that staff development was a crucial prerequisite for meeting student needs, more concern was shown in 1979-80 for determining staff needs than student needs.

Total numbers of needs assessments conducted and persons providing the data were not calculated because there appeared to be some confusion among project directors about (1) the definition of needs assessment, and (2) the way to report numbers. Two project directors reported that they had conducted more than 100 needs assessments; one project report included percentages rather than numbers of persons providing information.

Staff Development

All 17 projects for which final checklists were provided included evidence that career education inservice training activities had been conducted. A total of 3,953 educators participated in these activities (see Table 16). The career education topic most frequently addressed in the inservice activities was understanding the nature and goals of career education, which was presented in all 17 projects (see Table 17). Developing a career education plan, developing competence to infuse career education into the curriculum, and learning ways to assist students in broadening career goals each were topics for 16 projects. Designing methods to overcome stereotyping/bias in career education (15 projects) and acquainting participants with changing work patterns of men and women (14 projects) were also discussed by most projects. All 17 projects had conducted inservice presentations which would acquaint their personnel with career education concepts and better equip them to develop and implement career education programs in their respective systems consistent with their unique program goals.

Evidence that the inservice programs and other staff development activities did encourage teachers to engage in career activities and infusion methodology was shown in 16 projects. More than 1,611 classrooms were involved in career education infusion activities (see Table 18). This represents an average of over 115 classrooms per project for the 14 projects detailing numbers of classrooms. In addition, one project indicated that infusion occurred in two pilot schools at each grade level but did not specify the number of classrooms involved, while another project report did not give figures but stated that the plan was being implemented.

Curriculum guides were developed by three projects (4, 9, and 15) as means of facilitating the infusion process. If the classrooms contained an average of 25 students, the estimated number of students being reached by the infusion process during 1979-80 would be approximately 40,275 for the 14 projects supplying data. In view of the lack of specific data from some projects, this must be considered a conservative figure.

Some projects devoted 1979-80 career education efforts primarily to preliminary activities such as needs assessment, procurement and organization of materials, and development of a plan rather than implementation. Others focused on a pilot group to develop quality programs before extending their efforts to others in their respective systems. The number of classrooms affected would, therefore, be expected to grow in subsequent years as more projects become fully involved in infusion. The large number of classrooms in which career education infusion activities were being conducted during 1979-80 casts a very positive reflection of the leadership shown at both State and local levels.

TABLE 15

NEEDS ASSESSMENT CONDUCTED DURING 1979-80

		Project																
		1	2	3	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20	Total Number of Projects
9.1	Total number of needs assessments conducted	1	2	1	2	1	128	4	1	1	1		627	3	8	3		14
9.2	Total number of persons providing the assessment data	2567	302	30	1500	10%	672	307	11	15	25	130	10	165	1275	2900	241	16
9.3	Types of persons providing the assessment data																	
9.3.1	Teachers		225	12	140	10%	475	2600	9	5		100	1	23	90	153	235	14
9.3.2	Administrators	8	18	3	11	10%	128	21		3		10	1	1	7	26	32	14
9.3.3	Counselors	6	4	1	3	10%	69	15	2	7		2	6	1	1	3	7	15
9.3.4	Parents	124		2		10%								20	40			5
9.3.5	Students	1000			1345	10%								120	1100	2748		6
9.3.6	Others	10	67	5	7			11				7	1			60		8

TABLE 16. STAFF PARTICIPATION IN INSERVICE

	PROJECT																
PERSONNEL	1	2	3	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20	TOTAL
Project Administrators	2	1	3	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	26
Administrators	20	20	10	11	87	212	21	1	20	12	9	2	3	10	7	20	465
Secondary Counselors	2+	9	2	3	38	78	10	2	8	1	2		1	1	2	8	167
Elementary Counselors	2+		1		1		5		2			1					12
K-6 Teachers	70	169	99	80	80	65	99	6	145	88			8	40	34	233	1216
7-8 Teachers	49	64	19	25	125	45	75	1	87				9	10	3	106	618
9-12 Teachers	51		38	39	60	600	85		125	2				27	5	107	1139
Special Education Teachers	12	40	8	14	10	12	22	1	52	10		1	2	9	2	15	210
Other	19	18	5		35		11			1				3	2	12	106
TOTAL	227	321	185	173	438	1013	330	13	440	116	12	6	25	101	56	503	3959

Mean = 247

TABLE 17. AREAS ADDRESSED THROUGH INSERVICE

AREA	PROJECT																				
	1	2	3	5	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL	PERCENT OF ALL PROJECTS
Nature and goals of career education	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	17	85
Developing a career education plan	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	16	80
Developing competency to infuse career education into the curriculum	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	16	80
Awareness of changing work patterns of men and women	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	14	70
Designing methods to overcome bias/stereotyping	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	15	75
Learning ways to assist students in broadening career goals	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	16	80

TABLE 18

NUMBER OF CLASSROOMS INVOLVED IN PROJECTS IN WHICH CAREER EDUCATION WAS INFUSED INTO CURRICULAR AREAS

Project	1	2	3	6	8	9*	10	11	12**	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	Total
K-6 Classrooms	69	169	29	25	38		98	81			20	8	44		18	136	735
7-8 Classrooms	109	64	17	15	28		63	24		12		2	10	50	3		397
9-12 Classrooms	174		38	28	25		75	43		14	16	22	28				463
Comprehensive Developed Classrooms	1	1	6	2	2			1					4				17
Total	353	234	90	70	93		236	149		26	16	32	90	50	21	136	1,612

* Pilot schools in January-February
**Being implemented

Other Project Activities

Evidence of career education activities and projects which actually reached students was provided in various ways in the final project reports. Fourteen projects established a total of 82 career resource centers, for an average of 5.8 centers per system (see Table 19). All 17 project checklists showed that career education materials had been purchased (see Table 12). Figures for 15 projects showed a total of 12,687 items purchased, or an average of 846 items per project (see Table 19).

Three hundred eighty-two students were provided with work experiences for the purpose of career exploration in six projects. The largest number of students to benefit from this type of experience was in Project 8, where 150 students participated.

Five projects (2,3,9,15, and 17) conducted specific activities beyond inservice training to eliminate bias/stereotyping. Among them were:

- Four teachers spent two weeks developing materials which infused career education into the reading and math materials currently used in grades K-3.
- A poster contest was held focusing on men and women in non-traditional jobs.
- Activities were developed for the handicapped related to career education.
- Displays were put up at the high school on non-traditional roles.
- "What's My Line" game was used.
- "Individual Differences" story was written.
- One system conducted 12 sex equity workshops during 1979-80 for various groups of teachers, counselors, principals, and other educators.

Thirteen systems established comprehensive career guidance programs (career guidance and counseling, placement and follow-up services utilizing counselors, teachers, parents, and community resource personnel).

Time and energy was also expended in informing the public about career education and about the local projects in particular. It is estimated that over 49,000 persons were reached through presentations (excluding radio, television, and inservice for teachers). Added to the number of people reached by the 106 newspaper articles and 10 magazine or periodical articles, these data indicate that a sizable number of Tennessee citizens were exposed to information about career education during 1979-80. Undoubtedly such exposure was at least partially responsible for public support, through funding, of career education at the local level.

Project Evaluations

The manner in which project evaluations were conducted and reported varied greatly in quantity and quality. Seventeen projects reported conducting one or more evaluation studies for a total of 63 studies (see Table 20) based on responses from 8,801 persons. Teachers most frequently provided evaluative data (13 projects), followed by administrators (12 projects), counselors (11 projects), and students (7 projects).

Outside evaluators conducted part or all of the evaluations for three projects. Some projects indicated that they had used only informal evaluation procedures. Evaluation instruments of some type were used in 14 projects. The narrative reports provided the major source of information concerning the types of evaluation undertaken. From the narratives it appeared

TABLE 19

PROJECT ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND PUBLICITY EFFORTS

Project	1	2	3	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20	Total	Mean
Number of career resource centers established with career education funds.		16	11	2	2		2	11	5	11	1	2	1	3	2	13	82	5.857
Number of career education materials purchased with career education funds.	1,199	763	276	733	3,960	10	225	437	1,007		1,770	560	110	327	147	400	12,687	845.8
Number of students provided with work experiences for the purpose of career exploration.	51			33	180		50	50					18				382	63.7
Number of persons reached through presentations about career education project (excluding radio, television, and inservice for educators).	200	2,000	3,000	100	56	3,500	200	20,000	30	10,000	50	98			60	10,000	49,294	352.1
Number of newspaper articles released concerning career education project.	2	2	3	8	4	2	1	5	2	6	3		2	55	1	10	106	7.07
Number of articles in magazines or periodicals.	1				2	1	3							2	1		10	1.7

TABLE 20

NUMBERS OF EVALUATION STUDIES AND SOURCES OF DATA

Project	1	3	6	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	19	20
Total number of evaluation studies completed	2	4	4	1	1	14	1	2	1		2		26	1	4
Total number of persons providing evaluation data	138	30	800	40	672	5,068	2		16			222	1,200	91	500
Types of persons providing evaluation data															
Teachers	127	15	140		475	8		60	11	5		19	90	3	397
Administrators	5	6	11		128	2		2	4	10		2	7		19
Counselors	6	2	3		69	4			1			1	1		6
Parents		2	20							10			40		
Students			600			5,054				10		200	1,100	88	78
Others		5	20							7			50		

that 10 of the projects had developed one or more of the instruments used. When instruments were developed, there was no indication of attempts to establish reliability or validity. Instruments were seldom included in the final reports, thus it was difficult to determine the content and format of some of them. The title given an instrument could not accurately convey whether the instrument measured attitude, knowledge, or both.

Specific results obtained from the evaluations were not always reported. Some project directors did an excellent job of presenting evaluation results, as did the outside evaluators, but in some instances the results were summarized with a general comment, such as: "a positive attitude was found", "evaluative comments were recorded", and "informal evaluation has been made".

Only five project reports (2, 8, 11, 13, and 15) contained specific evaluative data. Three (11, 13, and 15) projects utilized the services of external evaluators. A teacher attitude scale was used on a pretest-posttest basis with teachers from projects 11 and 13 who participated in inservice workshops conducted independently by the same consultant. Forms from the two groups were combined for the analysis. Teachers showed significantly more self-confidence in reference to career education on each of the 18 items on the posttest when scores were compared to those on the pretest.

One of the project evaluations (Project 11) included pretest interviews conducted during on-site visits in May and posttest data collection by mail in late summer. Results showed progress was made toward curriculum evaluation, development of activities, and identification of resources.

Teacher perceptions and student knowledge were assessed once during the conduct of Project 15. A sample of sixth graders earned above average percentile ranks on all five knowledge scales as well as the attitude scale of the Career Maturity Inventory.

Project 3 conducted its own evaluation using the Olympus needs assessment on a pretest-posttest basis. Significant gains were made in student information but not in either occupational or self-awareness.

Teacher surveys indicated a positive attitude toward career education in four projects (1, 2, 15, 20). Career education infusion activities were reported as having been carried out by 100 percent of those responding in Project 1, 88% of those surveyed in Project 8 (a total of 26 respondents); and by most teachers in Project 17.

In the report for Project 17 increases were noted in student self, career, educational, and economic awareness using a variety of instruments. In Project 8, it was estimated by teachers that 50-65% of the students were exposed to career education activities.

Projects 9, 12, and 16 reported that workshop and inservice evaluations had been conducted, but no results were cited. Project 20 stated that staff development activities had been "helpful".

Since infusion activities were conducted in a large number of classrooms and students were provided with work experiences as well, evaluation of these efforts should have included some measures of student outcomes. As has been mentioned previously, teachers provided evaluation data in almost twice as many projects as did students.

In order to accord the proper importance to evaluation results, copies of the instruments should be included with the report unless they are commercial, standardized instruments. Numerical data should be presented which show (or do not show) such results as a change in the participants' knowledge or attitudes, mean ratings given speakers, or usage rates for materials. Simply stating that the evaluation was done or that results

were positive does not provide evidence of program merit. Project directors who do not feel confident about presenting evaluation results should be encouraged to utilize outside evaluators, or workshops or other means should be provided to assist them to gain the skills necessary for presenting evidence which supports the worth of their programs.

Funding and Expenditures

A total of $252,079.22 in Career Education Incentive funds was expended by the 20 local projects during 1979-80. The largest percentage of Incentive funds (77%) was spent on instruction (see Table 21), with a total of $194,400.89. The major component within that classification ($119,027.14) was instructional supplies and other printed/published materials. Administrative expenditures ($25,995.06) accounted for 10 percent of the total, fixed expenses ($16,132.81) 6 percent, equipment for instruction ($10,466.75) 4 percent, indirect charges ($4,278.85) 1.7 percent, and supplies and materials for the handicapped ($804.86) less than 1 percent.

Projects did not follow a uniform procedure in reporting expenditures, making summarization difficult. The budget information in this report has been presented in the categories used in the State reporting system, the system employed in the largest number of reports. Although the State Coordinator had requested that projects report funds in the terms required for her federal report, (i.e., career guidance programs, needs assessment/evaluation, career education in instructional programs, collaboration, private school efforts, and other) this request was almost uniformly disregarded. To ensure that this type of reporting takes place, the requirement must be made clear to project directors. They should be provided with a copy of a report form which contains a detailed explanation of the expenses that should be assigned to each category.

In addition to the $252,079.22 in Career Education Incentive funds used by the 20 projects, 12 of the projects reported that an additional $218,817.30 from other sources had been expended in support of career education (see Table 22). This figure must be considered conservative since three projects did not submit the summary checklist where this information should have been recorded. In addition, those systems that filed reports but did not respond to this item may not have taken time to determine the fund-equivalents provided by the local systems. The largest contributors were the local systems supplying a total of $182,082.30.

The fact that some projects not only matched but even exceeded their incentive fund allocation indicates a commitment to career education in the local systems and reflects the enthusiasm with which project directors pursued their objectives in the first funding year. This indication of support suggests that these programs will be continued when federal funds are no longer available and is a very positive commentary on the progress of career education activities in Tennessee.

Recommendations from Project Reports

In their final reports local project directors made the following recommendations for the State-wide leadership effort:

- Local programs should be funded early in the school year to establish continuity in the program activities and evaluation.
- A workshop should be conducted to explain to project directors exactly what is expected on the mid-point and final report forms. (Project directors felt the instructions were somewhat ambiguous.)

TABLE 21. PROJECT EXPENDITURES OF INCENTIVE FUNDS

BUDGET CATEGORY	PROJECT																			
ADMINISTRATION	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
2110.9 Salaries	1,933.00									1,212.91											3,145.91
2120.1 Travel	980.00					151.23				3,624.41											4,755.64
2120.6 Audit Contract										313.78											313.78
Career Education Coordinator		11,413.28																	5,724.98		17,138.26
Travel Coordinator		380.92																	181.77		562.69
Advisory Committee													78.75								78.75

TABLE 21. (CONTINUED)

INSTRUCTION	PROJECT																				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
2210.31 Teachers				9,908.15					9,280.36				2,412.02		10,254.00						31,852.53
2210.32 Substitute Teachers			980.00													75.25					1,055.25
2210.42 Guidance Personnel														7,400.50							7,400.50
2210.52 Aides						1,470.00										61.15	2,650.00				4,181.15
2220.11 Travel-Instructional Personnel			161.44	2,783.60	13.05	785.00	1,064.00	1,008.06	768.42		1,676.24		516.09	698.76	511.56	167.10	736.39				10,889.71
2220.2 Consultant				1,030.72	100.00	500.00	2,762.00						572.52			170.00	273.00		150.50		5,558.74
2220.9 Other Contracted Services	12,500.00				187.50					4,200.00	1,167.14	125.00			400.00					1,403.00	19,982.64

TABLE 21. (CONTINUED)

INSTRUCTION (Continued)	PROJECT 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
2230.1 Supplies			447.26	162.38	518.80	338.37	174.00		2,662.80		8,306.62	10,175.00		5,765.98	5,765.98	1,536.47	792.78				36,241.53
2244 Other Printed/ Published Materials			7,429.04	3,807.65	979.65	4,331.20				4,331.20				977.57			2,257.70		1,696.56		30,233.25
2290.1 Evaluation/ Testing				7.64										427.80		65.28	791.66			288.00	1,580.38
Other (Inservice)					1,350.00					152.28										13,407.31	1,502.28
Salaries								4,999.00												13,407.31	18,406.31
Supplies & Materials	788.08	7,048.03						9,449.28					661.83					1,019.00		3,590.14	22,552.36
Field Trips Inservice & Staff Development			982.26																		982.26

TABLE 21. (CONTINUED)

FIXED CHARGES	PROJECT 1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
2851.1 Local Retirement									1,202.58												1,202.58
2851.21 Social Security		699.78		607.37		90.12			568.89					453.65	414.02		162.45		351.20		3,347.48
2851.22 Handling Charges				6.63																	6.63
2851.3 Unemployment Compensation										72.14									61.37		133.51
2851.4 State Retirement		1,757.52		1,541.05		136.70								1,313.54	1,036.19		88.33		875.35		6,566.68
2851.5 Employee Insurance		46.13													65.95				60.00		172.08
2852.3 Workmen's Unemployment Compensation		35.24								12.50											46.74
Unspecified	403.92																			3,640.19	4,657.11

TABLE 21. (CONTINUED)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	TOTAL
CAPITOL OUTLAY 3273.31 Equipment for Instruction	1,790.94					275.00								1,010.21	4,025.00		92.29				10,406.75
HANDICAPPED 3600 Supplies & Materials								605.50												199.36	804.86
3920 Indirect Cost	395.00	676.47		144.81				325.16	375.05					1,053.22	819.14					490.00	4,278.85

TABLE 22. FUNDS EXPENDED IN SUPPORT OF CAREER EDUCATION AND THEIR SOURCES.

Project	1	2	3	6	8	10	12	13	14	15	16	17	Total
Local Educational Agency	40,968	14,234	13,589	39,655.80	32,775		14,100	7,000	9,400.50	5,580	3,780	1,000	182,082.30
TITLE IV B					3,000								3,000.00
TITLE IV C						21,370							21,370.00
Local Industry							800						800.00
Research Coordinating Unit (State Dept.)								11,635					11,635.00
Total													218,887.30

- Streamline reporting forms with more checklists.
- Get "career education" written into the Rules and Regulations for State-wide endorsement.
- Timetables for reports, etc. should be given to local systems well in advance of the due dates
- The State Advisory Council should be given more input in deciding which systems are to be funded for second and third years.
- A concise formal evaluation procedure should be designed so that project directors will know what tests can be used to measure students' progress.

Achievement of State Objectives Through Local Project Activities

Several of the State Coordinator's leadership objectives were achieved through local project activities as reported in the final project reports. However, there was some difficulty in determining whether some objectives had been met because the project reports did not address them directly. While 80% of the projects conducted inservice on infusion techniques, it could not be determined whether this included instruction as to the most appropriate delivery of materials (Subgoal C3). No criterion level was established for this subgoal, and the evaluators could only infer that it was achieved through the inservice on infusion.

Many of the Coordinator's objectives were stated in terms of criterion levels to be reached. The accomplishment of these objectives is shown in Table 23. Even with no data available on two projects and only partial data on two others, it is evident that only two of these objectives were not achieved through project activities during 1979-80. Only five project reports described at least three activities carried out to reduce bias/stereotyping in their narratives. If this had been asked directly as an item on the checklist, greater response might have resulted.

It was hoped that 80% of the project directors would provide awareness sessions for other staff to enable them to assess bias/stereotyping in materials. While 75% of the projects did conduct inservice on eliminating bias/stereotyping, only 85% of the projects responded to the checklist which contained this item. If all 20 projects had supplied complete reports, it seems highly likely that this objective, like most of the others, would have been meet or exceeded.

TABLE 23

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF STATE COORDINATOR'S CRITERION-BASED PROJECT-REFERENCED OBJECTIVES

Objective	Subgoal	Percent of Projects 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100
Project plans include emphasis on reducing bias/stereotyping	A4	----------→ **********
Evidence that at least 3 activities were carried out to reduce bias/ stereotyping	A4	----------→ **********
Provided inservice in career education concepts, infusion techniques	B1	----------→ **********
Established an Advisory Council	C2	----------→ **********
Established a comprehensive career guidance program	C2	-------→ **********
Developed and used an evaluation instrument	C2	----------→ **********

Legend

----------→ Criterion level

********** Level of accomplishment

TABLE 23 (CONTINUED)

ACCOMPLISHMENT OF STATE COORDINATOR'S CRITERION
BASED PROJECT-REFERENCED OBJECTIVES

Objective	Subgoal	Percent of Projects 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 80 85 90 95 100
Established a career resource center	C1	----------> **********
Implemented collaborative activities with community organizations	C2	----------> **********
Implemented work experiences for the purpose of career exploration	C2	-------> **********
Provided awareness sessions for other staff to enable them to assess bias/ stereotyping in materials	C3	----------> **********
Purchased instructional and career guidance materials	C3	----------> **********

Legend
----------> Criterion level
********** Level of accomplishment

SECTION 9

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Following completion of the 1979-80 State Plan for Career Education in Tennessee staff in the Bureau of Educational Research and Service at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville analyzed data from instruments designed and administered by others to provide an external evaluation of the leadership activities carried out in support of the State Plan.

Needs Assessment

Needs assessment data collected from a state-wide sample of superintendents, principals, teachers and community leaders in Tennessee during the year prior to the writing of the 1979-80 State Plan provided evidence that instructional materials and inservice training for staff constituted the most critical needs to be addressed if career education were to be implemented in more classrooms throughout the State. Local needs assessments which were included in proposals submitted for competitive Career Education Incentive funds in 1979 contained confirming evidence that these were the needs that must be met if students in Tennessee's public schools were to acquire knowledge of career education concepts.

Thirteen objectives in the 1979-80 State Plan for Career Education in Tennessee dealt with staff training and provision of instructional materials. Thus the Plan was designed to provide an effective response to established needs.

Leadership/Coordination Activities

In providing leadership and coordination for career education activities in Tennessee the State Coordinator attained all except two of her stated objectives. By the end of the project year the listing of consultants for local education agencies had not been completed, but this list was finalized in January 1981. While preliminary contacts had been made, representatives of teacher preparation institutions in the State had not been brought together to discuss the implications of career education for their programs.

State Advisory Council

In December 1980 the evaluators mailed a questionnaire which was returned by 19 of 24 members, or 80 percent, of the current State Advisory Council for Career Education. Questionnaire responses indicated almost unanimous agreement among the members that (1) the role defined by the State Coordinator for the State Advisory Council was an appropriate one, (2) the Council had functioned during 1979-80 in the manner prescribed in the State Plan, and (3) the Council had accomplished the tasks assigned to it. When asked how the effectiveness of the Advisory Council could be improved, members expressed strong interest in increasing the number of Council meetings.

Technical Assistance Workshops

The State Coordinator planned and conducted three regional technical assistance workshops in 1979. The workshops were designed to prepare representatives of local education agencies to develop proposals for career education projects. All workshop participants who subsequently wrote and submitted proposals received funding. Eighty-three percent of those who completed a questionnaire distributed at the end of each workshop rated the overall conduct of the workshop "superior" or "truly outstanding."

Workshop on Bias/Stereotyping

The evaluators encountered a number of problems in attempting to analyze and interpret evaluative data supplied by American Institutes for Research following a workshop on bias/stereotyping conducted by AIR. Despite the technical problems the data seemed to indicate that the workshop was successful in heightening the sensitivity of participants to the problems of age and sex discrimination. Seventy-five percent of the funded local projects were represented at the workshop, a figure which exceeded the 60 percent criterion level specified in the State Plan.

Workshops for Counselors

Evaluative information for three regional workshops sponsored by the State Department of Education for counselors in Tennessee either was not collected or was lost.

Career Education Festival

Evaluative information on the state-wide conference, the "Career Education Festival", which was held in Gatlinburg in July 1980 was obtained from only 17 of the 150 persons (11%) in attendance. While response from such a small number cannot be considered truly representative, information provided on the evaluative instrument indicated that (1) the instrument failed to reflect the real objectives of the conference or (2) the conference was designed for the wrong audience since most of the respondents indicated that they had adequate knowledge of the concepts listed on the form prior to their participation in the conference. The program appeared to have been designed to create awareness of career education while the audience--principally, personnel associated with funded career education projects--was well beyond the awareness stage in its orientation. Written comments supplied by the participants who completed evaluation forms furnished some evidence that the Career Education Festival was a positive experience, but the small number of forms made available to the evaluators did not provide a strong foundation for this conclusion.

Final Reports from Local Projects

Final financial reports were submitted at the end of the project year by all local project directors. However, the financial report was the only information provided by 2 of the 20 directors. In addition, two other project directors filed incomplete final written reports.

Sixteen of 17 reports which included information on local advisory councils indicated that such a group had been established to guide the project and assist its director. Fourteen of the 17 projects had involved business and industry, government agencies, civic groups and/or professional organizations in their career education programming.

Sixteen local projects incorporated one or more needs assessments during 1979-80. However, little supportive data indicating what needs were identified

was included in the final reports. There seemed to be some lack of understanding among project directors concerning the nature and purpose of needs assessment.

All projects for which inservice training was described in the final report included an inservice component. Approximately 4,000 educators participated in the training provided with career education funds. Subsequently infusion activities were conducted in more than 1600 classrooms, an average of 115 classrooms per reporting project. If each classroom contained 25 students, over 40,000 students received instruction in career education concepts as a result of the expnediture of Career Education Incentive funds in Tennessee during 1979-80.

All reporting projects purchased instructional materials; three developed their own curriculum guides incorporating career education concepts. Fifteen projects purchased almost 13,000 items, or an average of 846 items per project. Fourteen projects established a total of 82 career resource centers--5.8 centers per project on the average--from which to disseminate the purchased materials.

Six projects provided work experiences for a total of 382 students. Five projects reported conduct of specific activities other than inservice training to combat bias/stereotyping. Thirteen projects established comprehensive career guidance programs.

Project directors estimated that they had reached over 49,000 Tennesseeans through presentations of career education information to community groups. In addition, over 100 newspaper, magazine and journal articles were written by local personnel to publicize career education.

Tennessee spent approximately $252,000 of Career Education Incentive funds on local projects in 1979-80. Most funds (77%) were spent on instruction, with over 60 percent of the instructional total allocated to purchase of materials. Administrative expenditures accounted for 10 percent of the funds, fixed expenses 6 percent, equipment for instruction 4 percent, indirect charges 1.7 percent, and supplies and materials for the handicapped less than 1 percent.

Twelve local project directors reported that in addition to the Career Education Incentive funds, $218,817 from other sources had been spent in support of their activities during 1979-80.

Although 17 of the project reports contained evidence that some form of evaluation had been conducted during the project year, very little supportive data was provided, so it was difficult to assess the purposes, methods, and outcomes of this activity. Only five projects provided any numerical data, and even in these reports appropriate controls were not always evident.

Information contained in the final project reports provided strong support for the conclusion that much was accomplished across the State of Tennessee with Career Education Incentive funds during 1979-80. Criterion levels established for achievement of several of the leadership objectives in the State Plan were met or exceeded as a result of the activities carried out by local project directors.

Unfortunately, however, it was not possible to assess the extent to which a few of the objectives in the State Plan had been met because questions related to those objectives had not been included in the outline for final project reports. For instance, although 80 percent of the projects incorporated an inservice component, there was no accompanying question designed to determine if the inservice training covered appropriate methods for delivery of materials. There was no item which addressed the number or kind of activities for reducing bias/stereotyping that the projects had carried out. Copies or descriptions of curriculum guides developed locally were not requested, so it was impossible to assess the extent or quality of such development.

The project report outlines did not permit the evaluators to assess the effectiveness of local project management. The State Coordinator alone made

site visits, and her assessments of project directors and their successes or limitations was included in her final report. In several cases where project management was not as effective as it might have been, insufficient initial administrative commitment to the career education project appeared to have been a significant factor. Some of the persons who eventually became career education project directors shouldered that responsibility in addition to an already full work load.

From comments supplied by 1979-80 local project directors the evaluators detected some dissatisfaction with the method and outcome of awarding the funds for local projects to be carried out in 1980-81. Several of the criterion-based objectives in the State Plan for Career Education in Tennessee are stated in such a way that the reader is led to assume that projects funded the first year will continue for a second and third year, increasing their level of achievement of the objective with each successive year. Some of the 1979-80 project directors who did not receive funding for continuation in 1980-81 thus were surprised and quite disappointed to find that their programs would be cut short. (Some of these directors had received favorable reviews in the State Coordinator's final report.)

Undoubtedly a few of the projects funded in 1979-80 should not have been continued for one reason or another, poor performance being the most compelling of those. But nearly one-third (7 of 20) of the 1979-80 projects were not refunded. This generated some ill will among project directors who felt they had met expectations and yet had to see a good program come to a premature end. This also meant that some of the increased levels of performance specified for criterion-based objectives in the State Plan will be harder to achieve in 1980-81 because only two-thirds of the 1980-81 projects have the first year's experience upon which to build. Projects with continuous funding for three years will be able to focus on acquisition of materials and training of staff during the early period, then turn to the accomplishment of specific objectives with students in the second and third years. New projects begun in the second and third funding cycles also will have to start with materials acquisition and staff training but will have a shorter time over which to show improvement in student outcomes.

Recommendations

Objectives

The 1979-80 State Plan for Career Education in Tennessee contains objectives clearly based on needs identified in the State through prior needs assessments. The criterion levels set with regard to achievement of objectives related to acquisition of materials and provision of inservice training in career education seem appropriate and realistic in view of the levels of accomplishment attained in 1979-80.

However, instructional materials and trained educators are only means to an end: that of meeting student needs and improving student achievement of career education objectives. The objectives of the 1979-80 State Plan are largely process-oriented, i.e., they can be assess by asking simply, "Were these things done?" In subsequent years there should be more emphasis in the State Plan on the quality with which those objectives are met. And quality in the case of a career education program can best be assessed by measuring student outcomes.

The evaluators strongly recommend that more emphasis be placed in subsequent State Plans, by re-phrasing old objectives or formulating new ones, on the effects of career education programming on Tennessee's student population.

Eleven of the twelve 1979-80 local project proposals which contained objective needs assessment data focused first on the needs of students. According to these data, Tennessee's students need to:

- increase their self understanding
- acquire more realistic information about the vast variety of careers and the characteristics of successful workers in those careers
- acquire increased appreciation for the value of work and the interdependence of jobs
- increase their awareness of the relationship between basic skills and their application in the world of work
- improve their knowledge of the variety of productive uses one can make of leisure time
- improve their decision-making skills
- learn job-seeking skills
- increase their participation in job exploration and part-time employment.

These student outcomes can be measured. Related objectives should be made part of the State Plan and local projects should begin to acquire baseline data during the current year which can be compared with data collected in future years to show student progress, or lack thereof, as career education programs become institutionalized in target schools across Tennessee.

Involvement of Teacher Preparation Institutions

Additional steps should be taken by the State Coordinator to enlist the assistance of teacher preparation institutions in her efforts to increase the pool of trained educators who can and will provide career education for every student at every grade level.

Advisory Council

Advisory Council members feel they have an important role, and their advice and counsel have been very valuable to the State Coordinator. The Council should be brought together at least twice each year. Perhaps a series of three regional meetings involving significant travel only by the State Coordinator could cut the cost of travel which currently prohibits one of the recommended meetings.

Evaluation

The State Coordinator is an enthusiastic exponent of career education. She is conscientious and works hard. This combination of enthusiastic dedication and intense motivation combined with her attractive and forceful personality make her an extremely effective director of career education. It has been frustrating and disappointing to the evaluators not to be able to demonstrate unequivocally the high quality of her work and the results she has achieved. However, the fact is that the results of isolated, independent evaluation efforts which the evaluators attempted to fuse for the purposes of this report were insufficient to provide strong evidence of the effectiveness of the job being done with Career Education Incentive funds in Tennessee. Lack of time and expertise in program evaluation make it impossible for the State Coordinator

and local project directors to do an adequate job of evaluating the accomplishment of career education objectives at the State or local level. An overall evaluation plan needs to be designed and carried out by an external evaluator. Such a plan would help to ensure that systematic data collection occurs throughout the project year: that questions asked in evaluation instruments match the objectives of the activity being evaluated; that an appropriate proportion of respondents complete the instruments; that the instruments are reliably collected; and that the data are appropriately tabulated, analyzed, and interpreted.

Instrument design and/or selection for assessment at the local level is especially critical. Presently local project directors are not recognizing the need to match the content of assessment instruments with the objectives of their programs. They will not be likely to demonstrate improvement using instruments that measure outcomes other than those they intend to promote.

Site visits to local projects by the evaluator must be added to the overall evaluation plan if the evaluator is to make a valid interpretation of material supplied in the progress reports prepared by the local directors.

Project Selection

Some local project directors expressed interest in seeing the State Advisory Council acquire more influence in the final selection of projects to be funded. The evaluators have no other basis on which to recommend that there be any change in the final selection process, so no such recommendation will be made. However, some thought must be given at the State level--probably by the State Coordinator in consultation with the Advisory Council--to the question of continuity, or lack thereof, in the participation of local projects over the three years of funding. The long-range effect of the turnover of one-third of the projects for the second funding cycle needs to be considered. Will turnover be this great or greater when the third cohort of projects is selected? If so, will the impact of that turnover be positive or negative on the achievement of objectives in the State Plan?

Proposal Guidelines

Guidelines for the next set of project proposals for competitive funds should contain a section describing the level of administrative commitment to and support of the career education project. A clear commitment to allow the project director sufficient time and access to resources to do the most effective job should be evident. If no commitment is made to an overall state plan for evaluation of the level of accomplishment of career education objectives across Tennessee, proposal guidelines also should include an expanded section on evaluation, written by an external evaluation consultant, which specifies the kinds of evaluative information which should be collected in connection with each broad category of program objectives.